



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/522,314

01/25/2005

Takashi Ono

03500.017422.

5994

5514

7590

10/05/2009

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO

1290 Avenue of the Americas

NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER

KASSA, HILINA S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/05/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/522,314	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ONO, TAKASHI	
	<b>Examiner</b> HILINA S. KASSA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/04/2009 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0142683 A1) and Thomson et al. (Request for comments 2462 IPv6 Stateless Autoconfiguration", The Internet

Art Unit: 2625

Engineering Task Force (IETF)(online), December 1998) and further in view of Dathathraya (US Patent Number 6,934,932 B2).

**(1) regarding claim 1:**

As shown in 2, Lam et al. discloses a composite image processing apparatus for performing a plurality of image processing functions, including a printer function and a scanner function (**52, 54, ¶ [0035], lines 5-9; note that various devices with multiple functions**), the apparatus comprising:

generate an IP address unique to each of the plurality of image processing functions based on the repeatedly acquired prefix information (**¶ [0036], lines 1-14; note that a unique IP address gets assigned for each device on the basis of the router**); and

a controller operable to communicate with a plurality of appliances on the network by using the IP addresses generated for the plurality of image processing functions (**¶ [0036], lines 1-7; note that the central processing unit communicates with each peripheral device via the unique IP address assigned to each device**) and operate each of the plurality of image processing functions via a common bus to execute communications between each of the plurality of image processing functions and at least one of the plurality of appliances (**¶ [0037], lines 1-7; note that IP address identification information allows multiple peripheral devices designed to be connected to a single local interface to be identified and utilized. In the example above, serial device 78 may be a modem or a printer. The modem and**

Art Unit: 2625

**printer each have a unique IP address to allow CPU 62 to communicate with the serial device currently connected), and to execute a transfer task for transferring packet data (§ [0037], lines 16-17; note that the interface 70 routes the information to the appropriate target peripheral utilizing the IP address associated with the packet),**

wherein the transfer task for transferring packet data is managed by an OS using buffer areas allocated to the printer function and the scanner function, respectively (§ [0038], lines 1-13; note that memory 64 has a lookup table/buffer that allocates a unique IP corresponding to the port number).

Lam et al. discloses most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching an IP address generator, connected to an IPv6 router on a network, operable to repeatedly acquire prefix information from the IPv6 router.

However, Nikander teaches an IP address generator, connected to an IPv6 router on a network, operable to repeatedly acquire prefix information from the IPv6 router (page 2, § [0002] of Introduction; note that IPv6 defines an auto configuration mechanism of routers. Also, the stateless mechanism allows a host to generate its own address using a combination of locally available information provided by the routers. Also, page 3 § [0004] such configuration is made automatically with a detection of duplicate address i.e. repeatedly acquiring prefix).

Lam et al. and Thomson et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 2625

ordinary skilled in the art to have an an IP address generator, connected to an IPv6 router on a network, operable to repeatedly acquire prefix information from the IPv6 router. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that IPv6 addresses lease to an interface for a fixed length of time (page 3, paragraph [0002], lines 1-5) and IPv6 defines both stateful and stateless address autconfiguration mechanism (page 2, paragraph [0002], lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lam et al. with Thomson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Lam et al. and Thomson et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching a composite image processing apparatus and transferring packet data is managed by an OS.

However, Dathathraya teaches a composite image processing apparatus and transferring packet data is managed by an OS (**column 7, lines 1-12; note that a MFP is disclosed and an OS is utilized as the system to manage the workflow**).

Lam et al., Thomson et al. and Dathathraya are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have a composite image processing apparatus and transferring packet data is managed by an OS. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently manage workflow using a plurality of scripts in MFP system (abstract, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lam et al., Thomson et al. with Dathathraya to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

**(2) regarding claim 8:**

Lam et al. further disclose the composite apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the IP address generator means sends each generated IP address to the router to check for duplication of the IP address (**paragraph [0038], lines 4-16; note that the unique IP address of the peripherals gets stored as a simple look up table, if change or addition needs to be made, a new IP gets generated**), and, if the IP address is a duplicate (**paragraph [0038], lines 8-9; note that if the IP address needs to be changed or added, a new IP gets generated**), the IP address generator generates an IP address different from the duplicate IP address based on the prefix information (**paragraph [0040], lines 3-22**).

5. The proposed combination of Lam et al., Thomson et al. with Dathathraya, explained in the rejection of apparatus claim 1, renders obvious the steps of the method of claim 3 and the computer-readable medium claim 5 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 3 and 5.

6. The proposed combination of Lam et al., Thomson et al. with Dathathraya, explained in the rejection of apparatus claim 8, renders obvious the steps of the method of claim 10 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed

combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claim 8 are equally applicable to claim 10.

7. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0142683 A1), Thomson et al. (Request for comments 2462 IPv6 Stateless Autoconfiguration", The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)(online), December 1998), Dathathraya (US Patent Number 6,934,932 B2) and further in view of Ouchi (US Patent Number 5,987,494, see IDS).

**(1) regarding claim 2:**

Lam et al. disclose control means performs the communicating using the IP addresses generated for the plurality of image processing functions based on the control task program (**paragraph [0036], lines 3-8; note that central processing unit communicates between each peripheral devices via the IP addresses that is assigned**).

Lam et al. Thomson et al. and Dathathraya disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the controller executes the plurality of image processing functions by executing, on a time-division basis using a task switchover, control task programs corresponding respectively to the plurality of image processing functions, and taking as a unit a control task program corresponding to an image processing function of the plurality of image processing functions.



However, Ouchi discloses wherein the controller executes the plurality of image processing functions by executing, on a time-division basis using a task switchover **(column 4, lines 9-15; note that control program has a timer to switchover tasks on every 1/60 seconds)**, control task programs corresponding respectively to the plurality of image processing functions **(column 4, lines 15-29; note that the control program, which is corresponding to a plurality of functions, on the basis of the timer)**, and taking as a unit a control task program corresponding to an image processing function of the plurality of image processing functions **(column 5, lines 27-40; note that control programs correspond to the plurality of functions of the multi-functional processing device)**.

Lam et al., Thomson et al., Dathathraya and Ouchi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. data processing for MFP. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the controller executes the plurality of image processing functions by executing, on a time-division basis using a task switchover, control task programs corresponding respectively to the plurality of image processing functions, and taking as a unit a control task program corresponding to an image processing function of the plurality of image processing functions. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to concurrently process a plurality of control programs using time sharing methods (column 1, lines 5-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lam et al., Thomson et al., Dathathraya and Ouchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

8. The proposed combination of Lam et al., Thomson et al., Dathathraya and Ouchi, explained in the rejection of apparatus claim 2, renders obvious the steps of the method of claim 4 and the computer-readable medium claim 6 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claim 2 are equally applicable to claims 4 and 6.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore could be reached at (571) 272- 7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pari-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Application/Control Number: 10/522,314

Page 10

Art Unit: 2625

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call  
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hilina S Kassa/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

September 30, 2009

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625